

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-4925**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

RAHEEM LYNELL GALLOWAY,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. William L. Osteen,  
Jr., Chief District Judge. (1:14-cr-00025-WO-1)

---

Submitted: May 21, 2015

Decided: May 26, 2015

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis C. Allen, Federal Public Defender, John A. Duberstein,  
Assistant Federal Public Defender, Greensboro, North Carolina,  
for Appellant. Lisa Blue Boggs, Assistant United States  
Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raheem Lynell Galloway appeals his guilty plea conviction for being a felon in possession of a firearm, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (2012). Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating that there are no meritorious grounds for appeal but questioning whether Galloway's 180-month sentence is unreasonable. Galloway was advised of his right to file a pro se supplemental brief, but he has not done so.

We review Galloway's sentence for reasonableness "under a deferential abuse-of-discretion standard." Gall v. United States, 552 U.S. 38, 41, 51 (2007). This review entails appellate consideration of both the procedural and substantive reasonableness of the sentence. Id. at 51. In determining procedural reasonableness, we consider whether the district court properly calculated the defendant's advisory Sentencing Guidelines range, gave the parties an opportunity to argue for an appropriate sentence, considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) (2012) factors, selected a sentence based on clearly erroneous facts, and sufficiently explained the selected sentence. Id. at 49-51. Galloway received a mandatory minimum sentence of 15 years, because of his status as an armed career criminal. See 18 U.S.C. § 924(e)(1) (2012). The district court listened to the arguments of the parties, reviewed the § 3553(a) factors,

and adequately explained its decision to impose a sentence at the bottom of Galloway's properly calculated advisory Guidelines range. Thus, we find his sentence was reasonable.

In accordance with Anders, we have thoroughly reviewed the record in this case and find no meritorious grounds for appeal. We therefore affirm Galloway's criminal judgment. This court requires that counsel inform Galloway, in writing, of the right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If Galloway requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on Galloway. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED